arXiv:1305.0046v2 [math.CV] 2 May 2013

FINITE TYPE DOMAINS WITH HYPERBOLIC ORBIT ACCUMULATION POINTS

BINGYUAN LIU

Abstract. In this paper, finite type domains with hyperbolic orbit accumulation points are studied. We prove, in case of $\mathbb{C}^2$, it has to be a (global) pseudoconvex domain, after an assumption of boundary regularity. Moreover, one of the applications will realize the classification of domains within this class, precisely the domain is biholomorphic to one of the ellipsoids $\{(z,w) : |z|^{2m}+|w|^2 < 1, m \in \mathbb{Z}^+\}$. This application generalizes [6] in which the boundary is assumed to be real analytic for the case of hyperbolic orbit accumulation points.

0. Introduction

Let Ω be a smooth bounded domain in $\mathbb{C}^n$ and $p \in \partial\Omega$. It was a long time since Greene-Krantz posted their conjecture in [9], which states, if p is a boundary orbit accumulation point, then p is a point of finite type. By orbit accumulationn boundary point p, we mean a boundary point $p \in \partial\Omega$ such that $\lim_{j\to\infty} f_j(q) = p$ where $q \in \Omega$ and $f_j \in \mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$. There are numerous works on this problem for 20 years by many mathematicians, e.g., we just mention some (in alphabet order), Eric Bedford, Jisoo Byun, Robert Greene, Kang-Tae Kim, Sung-Yeon Kim, Mario Landucci, Steven Krantz, Sergey Pinchuk, Jean-Christophe Yoccoz. Partial results have already been achieved, e.g. [2], [3], [4], [9], [10], [11], [12], [13], [14], [15]. Among those, recently, Sung-Yeon Kim publishes the result in her paper [12] which proves the Greene-Krantz conjecture in case of hyperbolic orbit accumulation points. In this note, we consider the domain with noncompact automorphism groups from another point of view, namely, to check whether it is globally pseudoconvex. By pseudoconvex, we usually mean here weakly pseudoconvex, since a strongly pseudoconvex domain with noncompact automorphism groups will make the domain a ball by the well-known Wong-Rosay theorem (see [20] and [23]).

Let $\Omega \in \mathbb{C}^2$ be a domain with real analytic boundary. It was shown by Bedford-Pinchuk that noncompact automorphism group implies Ω is biholomorphic to one of the ellipsoids $\{(z,w) : |z|^{2m}+|w|^2, m \in \mathbb{Z}^+\}$. On can easily check that ellipsoids are globally pseudoconvex. However, if the problem passes to the category of smooth boundary, i.e. the defining function is C^∞, the answer is not so clear as the domain with real analytic boundary. The difficulty is that some of the tools for real analytic boundary like Segre variety and analytic variety, cannot be used. Although David Catlin pointed out (unpublished) pseudoconvex domain with boundary of finite type with noncompact automorphism group implied to ellipsoid also, the condition "pseudoconvex" cannot be removed.

In the present note, we mainly work on the following result.

Date: May 3, 2013.

Theorem 0.1. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^2$ be a bounded domain with smooth boundary of finite type. Suppose that the Bergman kernel of Ω extends to $\overline{\Omega} \times \overline{\Omega}$ minus the boundary diagonal set as a locally bounded function. Let $p \in \partial\Omega$ be a hyperbolic orbit accumulation point. Then Ω is global pseudoconvex.*

The method of proof involves analysis of $\partial\Omega$ and the tools borrowed from CR geometry. We also try to write this note as concise as possible.

We should remark that in Theorem 0.1, "finite type" can be replaced with "boundary satisfying condition R in sense of Bell". Furthermore, the result is extended to higher dimensions in the author's forthcoming paper [16].

1. Preliminary

The Hilbert transform has a long history in both fields of one complex variable and several complex variables.

specifically, it is used to solve the Bishop equation, namely,

$$U(\zeta) = -T_1(\rho(Z(\cdot), \overline{Z(\cdot)}, U(\cdot)))(\zeta) + c, \zeta \in S^1$$

where T_1 is modified Hilbert transform, ρ is a defining function, Z is a given known analytic disc and c is a given real number.

In fact, Let M be a hypersurface in $\mathbb{C}^n = (z, w)$ with a defining function ρ, where $z \in \mathbb{C}^{n-1}$ and $z \in \mathbb{C}$. Suppose we are given an arbitrary analytic disc $Z : \overline{\Delta} \to \mathbb{C}^{n-1}$, where $\overline{\Delta}$ denotes the unit close disc in $\mathbb{C}$, and a real number c. By solving the Bishop equation, one can obtain an analytic disc $A(\zeta) = (Z(\zeta), W(\zeta))$ attached to M. Moreover the projection of $A(\zeta)$ onto z-component is exactly $Z(\zeta)$ and $\Re w(1) = c$. Precisely and more generally, by the solution of the Bishop equation, we usually mean the following (see also [1], [7] and [17]):

Let M be a smooth generic submanifold through 0, given by $v = \rho(z, \bar{z}, u), z \in \mathbb{C}^{n-d}, w = u + iv \in \mathbb{C}^d$ of class C^2 with $h(0) = 0$, $Dh(0) = 0$ and let $0 < \alpha < 1$. Then there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that for any analytic disc $Z : \Delta \to \mathbb{C}^n$ in $C^\alpha(\Delta)$ with $\parallel Z \parallel_\alpha < \epsilon$ and for any $c \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $|c| < \epsilon$, there exists a unique (small) analytic disc $A(\zeta) = (Z(\zeta), W(\zeta))$ of class C^α attached to M such that $\Re W(1) = c$. In addition, if ρ is of class C^k $(k \geq 0)$, then there is an $\epsilon > 0$ such that $H : C^\alpha(S^1, \mathbb{C}^{n-d}) \times \mathbb{R}^d \to C^\alpha(S^1, \mathbb{R}^d)$ depends in a C^{k-1} fashion on $c \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $Z \in C^\alpha(S^1, \mathbb{C}^{n-d})$, with $|c| < \epsilon$ and $\parallel Z \parallel_\alpha < \epsilon$. Here C^α denotes the class of Hölder continuous and $\parallel \cdot \parallel_\alpha$ denotes the norm of C^α.

With the solution of the Bishop equation, Trépreau and Tumanov proved two celebrated theorems (see [21] for case of hypersurface and [22] for case of submanifold). Specifically, for case of hypersurface, Trépreau proved that each CR function on a minimal hypersurface, can be extended to a holomorphic function in one side of the hypersurface locally.

Another important tool is developed by Kim(Kang-Tae)-Yoccoz in [11]. They borrowed well-known results from dynamical systems in [19] to study contractions in a CR geometry. Indeed, in case of hypersurface, they are able to prove a germ of hypersurface M admitting contractions, then the defining function can be written as $v = P(z, \bar{z})$, where P is a weighted homogeneous polynomial. More recently, Kim (Sung-Yeon) proved a theorem solving the Greene-Krantz conjecture in case of hyperbolic orbit accumulation points in [12]. He proved also in case of hyperbolic orbit accumulation points, around the orbit accumulation point, the germ of hyperbolic orbit accumulation point admits a contraction. This finishes partially the 20-years old conjecture.

In this note, we assume the Bergman kernel of Ω extends to $\overline{\Omega} \times \overline{\Omega}$ minus the boundary diagonal set as a locally bounded function. We should discuss its existence in the nonpseudoconvex case, and otherwise, there is no sense to prove the result. By [13], the nonpseudoconvex domain with a desired Bergman kernel exists, e.g. the shell.

2. Proof of Theorem 0.1

To prove Theorem 0.1, we need several lemmas.

Lemma 2.1. *Let Ω be a smooth bounded domain with boundary of finite type in $\mathbb{C}^2$. Suppose that the Bergman kernel of Ω extends to $\overline{\Omega} \times \overline{\Omega}$ minus the boundary diagonal set as a locally bounded function. Then for any hyperbolic orbit accumulation boundary point p, there exists a contraction $f \in \mathrm{Aut}(\Omega) \cap \mathrm{Diff}(\Omega)$ at p. Moreover, Ω is biholomorphic to the domain $\{(z, w) : v < P(z, \bar{z})\}$, where P is a homogeneous polynomial. This biholomorphism extends smoothly up to boundary around p.*

Proof. In view of Kim's theorem in [12], the "pseudoconvex" can be replaced with "finite type" to satisfy "condition R" in sense of Bell. By Kim-Yocooz's theorem in [11], one obtains the desired result easily, because a weighted homogeneous polynomial in one complex variable is homogeneous. □

Lemma 2.1 gives a good starting point for our work. In fact, it shows hyperbolic orbit accumulation points make $\partial\Omega$ defined with a rigid equation. By the rigid equation, we mean a equation without involving the real argument of w.

Since we are planning to work with a hypersurface, not a domain, we introduce a definition to name the pseudoconvexity of hypersurface. We want to remark our definition is slightly different from that in standard CR geometry in order to be adapted in our discussion. We also want to distinguish the two sides of a germ of hypersurface by the pseudoconvex side and the pseudoconcave side (see Section 3).

Definition 2.1. Let $M \subset \mathbb{C}^2$ be a piece of hypersurface defined by $v = \rho(z, \bar{z}, u)$. If there is a pseudoconvex (respectively, strongly pseudoconvex) domain $G \subset \mathbb{C}^2$ so that $M \subset \partial G$ and G is contained in $\{(z, \bar{z}, u, v) \in \mathbb{C}^2 : v < \rho(z, \bar{z}, u)\}$, then S is said to be pseudoconvex (respectively, strongly pseudoconvex). If G is contained in $\{(z, \bar{z}, u, v) \in \mathbb{C}^2 : v > \rho(z, \bar{z}, u)\}$, M is said to be pseudoconcave (respectively, strongly pseudoconcave).

With the definition above, the pseudoconvexity in a hypersurface defined by a rigid homogeneous polynomial will appear a nice property as what we are going to show.

Lemma 2.2. *Let M be a smooth hypersurface passing through $(0, 0)$ in $\mathbb{C}^2$ defined by $\rho = v - P(z, \bar{z})$, where P is a homogeneous polynomial with respect to z. Then locally around $(0, 0)$, the pseudoconvexity is solely determined by the argument of z.*

Proof. By elementary calculation, one observes the following facts.

1. (z, w) is Levi-flat if and only if $\Delta\rho = 0$,
2. (z, w) is pseudoconvex in sense of Definition 2.1 if and only if $\Delta\rho \leq 0$,
3. (z, w) is pseudoconcave in sense of Definition 2.1 if and only if $\Delta\rho \geq 0$.

So we just need to investigate the Laplacian of ρ. For this, we write $\Delta = \frac{1}{r}\frac{\partial}{\partial r} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial r^2} + \frac{1}{r^2}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta^2}$. Since ρ is a homogeneous polynomial, we find $\Delta\rho = 0$ just involve argument θ, not r. It is clear that the solution gives finite numbers for θ which is because of analyticity of $\Delta\rho$. Moreover the solution of $\Delta\rho = 0$ is union of intervals of θ, e.g. $\{\theta \in (\theta_1, \theta_2) \cup (\theta_3, \theta_4) \cup (\theta_7, \theta_9)\}$. It completes the proof. $\square$

Moreover, let $P_z : \mathbb{C}^2 \to \mathbb{C}$ be the projection which maps point (z, w) to the first component z. Then the pseudoconvex piece of M is given by $P_z^{-1}(\cup_i S_i) \cap M$ where S_i denotes the sectors where $\Delta\rho \leq 0$. The following Proposition gives a nice property which is useful in the proof of Theorem 0.1. Also, it is independently interesting, so we prove it in Section 3.

Proposition 2.1. *Let $D(0, \epsilon)$ be a disc center at 0 with radius ϵ. Let $M \subset \mathbb{C}^2$ be a hypersurface passing through $(0, 0)$ and satisfying the following properties: for $\{\theta\}_{i=1}^n \in [0, 2\pi)$ so that*

1. *$(z = x+iy = re^{i\theta}, w) \in M \cap P_z^{-1}D(0, \epsilon)$ is Levi-flat if and only if $\theta = \theta_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, n$. We denote Σ_0 as the set $\{(z = re^{i\theta}) : \theta = \theta_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, n\}$.*
2. *$(z = x + iy = re^{i\theta}, w) \in M \cap P_z^{-1}D(0, \epsilon)$ is strongly pseudoconvex if and only if there is $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$ so that $\theta_k < \theta < \theta_{k+1}$. We denote Σ_+ as the set $\{(z = re^{i\theta}) : \theta_k < \theta < \theta_{k+1}\}$.*
3. *$(z = x + iy = re^{i\theta}, w) \in M \cap P_z^{-1}D(0, \epsilon)$ is strongly pseudoconcave if and only if there is $l \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$ so that $\theta_l < \theta < \theta_{l+1}$. We denote Σ_- as the set $\{(z = re^{i\theta}) : \theta_l < \theta < \theta_{l+1}\}$.*

Then it has a holomorphic extension through $(0, 0)$ to both sides.

We are ready to prove our main theorem now.

Proof of Theorem 0.1. For the proof, we assume there is a strongly pseudoconcave point q (in regular sense for a boundary of a domain) at $\partial\Omega$; otherwise, the theorem follows, because it is well known that $\partial\Omega$ contains at least one strongly pseudoconvex point. By Lemma 2.1, we abuse $v = \rho(z, \bar{z})$ as a local defining function of $\partial\Omega$ with $p = (0, 0)$.

Under the assumption, we now prove there must be a strongly pseudoconcave point in any neighborhood of $(0, 0)$. In fact, by Bell-Ligocka's theorem in [6], any biholomorphism will extends as an automorphism of $\overline{\Omega}$ smoothly up to the boundary. Let $\{\phi_j \in \mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)\}$ be the family of biholomorphism there exists an interior point p' enjoying the property $\phi_j(p') \to (0, 0)$ and $\phi_j^{-1}(p') \to \tilde{p}$ as $j \to \infty$, where $\tilde{p}$ is the dual hyperbolic orbit accumulation point of p. Now we confuse ourselves ϕ_j as an element of $\mathrm{Aut}(\overline{\Omega})$.

We claim $q \neq \tilde{p}$ now. In fact, if q is an orbit accumulation point, then its property of pseudoconcave points contradicts with Greene-Krantz observation theorem in [10] which implying the orbit accumulation point cannot be a pseudoconcave point. Now, by Bell's theorem in [5], $\phi_j(q)$ maps q to a boundary point of Ω arbitrary close to $(0, 0)$

We can also see, there must be a strongly pseudoconvex point in any neighborhood of $(0, 0)$. Because, otherwise, there is a pseudoconcave neighborhood of $(0, 0)$ in $\partial\Omega$ and it contradicts with the Greene-Krantz observation theorem again.

By looking at Lemma 2.2, it forces both of inequalities $\Delta\rho < 0$ and $\Delta\rho > 0$ having solutions. By continuity, there must be (at least) two sectors $\{(r, \theta) :$

$S_1 := (\theta_j, \theta_{j+1})\}$ and $\{(r,\theta) : S_2 := (\theta_k, \theta_{k+1})\}$ such that $P_z^{-1}S_1 \cap \partial\Omega$ is strongly pseudoconvex but $P_z^{-1}S_2 \cap \partial\omega$ is strongly pseudoconcave.

In view of Proposition 2.1, we see that any CR function defined in a germ of Ω at p will extend to a holomorphic function to each side of $\partial\Omega$. We use a similar argument as in Greene-Krantz [10] to find the contradiction.

In fact, by Cartan's Theorem in [18], $J(\phi_j)$ must tend to zero at any point in Ω, where J denotes the Jacobian, because $\{\phi_j\} \to p$. On the other hand $\{\phi_j^{-1}\}$ is a family of automorphism and hence a normal family. Moreover, CR functions $J(\phi_j^{-1})|_{\partial\Omega}$ extends to the holomorphic hull $\widehat{\Omega}$ of Ω which at least contains p as an interior point by the discussion above. Now extensions $\widehat{J(\phi_j^{-1})}$ of $J(\psi_j^{-1})$ converges uniformly on any compact subset of $\widehat{\Omega}$. Pick up an compact subset K of $\widehat{\Omega}$ containing p, and then the limit of subsequence of $|\widehat{J(\psi_j^{-1})}|$ is bounded because $\{|J(\psi_j^{-1})|\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ are uniformly bounded. But this is impossible because $|J(\psi_j)|$ goes to zero. □

3. Proof of Proposition 2.1

Lemma 3.1. *There exists an analytic disc Z in $\mathbb{C}$ of which the image is totally contained in $\Sigma_+ \cup (0,0)$ so that $Z(1) = 0, \arg Z(-1) = \dfrac{\theta_{k+1} - \theta_k}{2}$. Moreover, the boundary of image is smooth except 0, Hölder continuous at 0 and the image is symmetric with respect to the ray $\theta = \dfrac{\theta_{k+1} - \theta_k}{2}$.*

Proof. This is easy to show with Riemann mapping theorem and Carathédory theorem mapping a close unit disc onto a smooth domain with an angle at 0 biholomorphically. Moreover, Z is continuous up to the boundary, smooth up to boundary points except 0. □

By the solution of the Bishop equation, there exists an analytic disc $A : \overline{\Delta} \to \mathbb{C}^2$ attached to $P_z^{-1}\Sigma_+ \cap M$. Let $A(z) = (Z(z) = X(z) + iY(z), W(z) = U(Z) + iV(z))$. By checking the modified Hilbert transform, it is elementary to see even if $Z(z)$ is not smooth at $z = 1$, $U(z)$ is always smooth around $z = 1$.

We introduce also the following definition to name the both sides of a hypersurface.

Definition 3.1. Let $M \subset \mathbb{C}^2$ be a pseudoconvex hypersurface in the sense of Definition 2.1, then we call the side of M contained in $\{(z,\bar{z},u,v) \in \mathbb{C}^2 : v > \rho(z,\bar{z},u)\}$ as the pseudoconvex side and otherwise, the pseudoconcave side. Let $M \subset \mathbb{C}^2$ be a pseudoconcave hypersurface, then we call the side of M contained in $\{(z,\bar{z},u,v) \in \mathbb{C}^2 : v > \rho(z,\bar{z},u)\}$ as the pseudoconcave side and otherwise, the pseudoconvex side.

Lemma 3.2. $\dfrac{\partial U}{\partial \theta}(0) \geq 0$. *That means $\dfrac{\partial A}{\partial r}(1)$ either points to pseudoconvex side or is tangent to M at $(0,0)$, if it exists.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, we let $Z_j(z)$ be a series of smooth analytic discs attached to $P_z^{-1} \cap M$ so that $Z_j(e^{i\theta}) \to Z(e^{i\theta})$ uniformly. Clearly, for each Z_j, it is entirely contained in Σ_+. By the solution of the Bishop equation, there is an analytic disc $A_j(z)$ attached to $P_z^{-1}\Sigma_+ \cap M$ so that $P_z A_j(z) = Z_j(z)$. Observe that

$\dfrac{\partial A_j}{\partial r}(1)$ cannot point to the pseudoconcave side; otherwise, it contradicts with the Lewy extension theorem. So $\dfrac{\partial A_j}{\partial r}(1)$ either points to the pseudoconvex side or is tangent to M. That means $\dfrac{\partial U_j}{\partial \theta}(0) \geq 0$. By taking limit on j, $\lim_{j\to\infty} \dfrac{\partial U_j}{\partial \theta}(0) = \dfrac{\partial U}{\partial \theta}(0) \geq 0$. □

If we can prove $\dfrac{\partial U}{\partial \theta}(0) > 0$, we can find a series of smooth analytic discs $A'_j(z) = (Z'_j(z), W'_j(z))$ attached to M passing through $(0,0)$ (note: we do not require A'_j to attach to $P_z^{-1}\Sigma_+ \cap M$ any more, because otherwise A'_j will not pass through $(0,0)$). And then there is an analytic disc A'_j for big enough j, such that $\dfrac{\partial U'_j}{\partial \theta}(0) > 0$ by continuity. That is, because of [17], $\dfrac{\partial A'_j}{\partial r}(1)$ is tangent to M. Thus, we would prove it has a holomorphic extension through $(0,0)$ to one side. And the Proposition 2.1 follows by considering another piece of pseudoconcave part.

However, $\dfrac{\partial U}{\partial \theta}(0) > 0$ follows from Lemma 3.3 below.

Lemma 3.3. *If* $\dfrac{\partial U}{\partial \theta}(0) = 0$*, then we can find another hypersurface* M' *which is different from* M *only around* $A(-1)$ *and also satisfies properties in Proposition 2.1 so that there exists an analytic disc* A' *satisfying* $\dfrac{\partial U'}{\partial \theta}(0) < 0$.

If the reader keeps the result of Lemma 3.3 in mind and reviews this section with M' instead of M, (s)he will find the conclusion of Lemma 3.3 is bull-shit! However, Lemma 3.3 is correct, which implies the condition never happens. That is,

Corollary 3.1. *Let hypersurface* M *be defined with a rigid equation and let analytic disc* A *be as in Lemma 3.3,* $\dfrac{\partial U}{\partial \theta}(0) > 0$. □

Proof of Lemma 3.3. Let $M = \{(z = x + iy, w = u + iv) : v = \rho(z, \bar{z})\}$ be a hypersurface of $\mathbb{C}^2$, and $A(z) = (Z(z) = X(z) + iY(z), W(z) = U(z) + iV(z))$ be an analytic disc attached to M. By the solution of the Bishop Equation $U(e^{i\theta}) = T_1(\rho(Z(e^{i\theta}), \bar{Z}(e^{i\theta}))$, where T_1 is the modified Hilbert operator.

Let two open sets $P \subset Q$ satisfy $A(-1) \in Q$ and $0 \notin \overline{Q}$. Let characteristic smooth function $\chi : \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{R}$ be such that

$$\chi(z, \bar{z}) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } z \in U \\ 0 & \text{if } z \notin V. \end{cases}$$

Define $\tau = \chi \cdot \epsilon |z|^2$, where ϵ is a small positive real number so that $M' := \{v = \rho - \tau\}$ has the same pseudoconvexity as M. Denote $\tau_1(e^{i\theta}) = \tau(Z(e^{i\theta}))$. If we show $\dfrac{\partial T_1\tau_1(e^{i\theta})}{\partial \theta}(0) < 0$, then we finish the proof.

In fact, the modified Hilbert transform is given by,

$$T_1\tau_1(e^{i\theta}) = \text{p.v.}\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{\tau_1(e^{i(\theta-t)})}{\tan(t/2)}\,\mathrm{d}t + C.$$

By changing variables, one obtains

$$T_1\tau_1(e^{i\theta}) = \text{p.v.}\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{-\pi+\theta}^{\pi+\theta}\frac{\tau_1(e^{it})}{\tan((\theta-t)/2)}\,\mathrm{d}t + C.$$

We claim that

$$\begin{aligned}\text{p.v.}\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{-\pi+\theta}^{\pi+\theta}\frac{\tau_1(e^{it})}{\tan((\theta-t)/2)}\,\mathrm{d}t &= \int_{-\pi+\theta}^{-\delta_1}\frac{\tau_1(e^{it})}{\tan((\theta-t)/2)}\,\mathrm{d}t \\ &\quad + \int_{\delta_2}^{\pi+\theta}\frac{\tau_1(e^{it})}{\tan((\theta-t)/2)}\,\mathrm{d}t\end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where $\delta_1, \delta_2 > 0$. Indeed, this is because our τ just change M around $A(-1)$ locally and most of values on unit circle vanishes.

Due to the claim, if $|\hat{\theta}| < \min\{\frac{\delta_1}{2}, \frac{\delta_2}{2}\}$

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial T_1\tau_1(e^{i\theta})}{\partial\theta}(\hat{\theta}) &= -\frac{1}{2}\int_{-\pi+\hat{\theta}}^{-\delta_1}\frac{\tau_1(e^{it})}{\sin^2((\hat{\theta}-t)/2)}\,\mathrm{d}t - \frac{\tau_1(e^{i(-\pi+\hat{\theta})})}{\tan(\pi/2)} \\ &\quad -\frac{1}{2}\int_{\delta_2}^{\pi+\hat{\theta}}\frac{\tau_1(e^{it})}{\sin^2((\hat{\theta}-t)/2)}\,\mathrm{d}t + \frac{\tau_1(e^{i(\pi+\hat{\theta})})}{\tan(-\pi/2)}.\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

In fact, $|\hat{\theta}| < \min\{\frac{\delta_1}{2}, \frac{\delta_2}{2}\}$ implies $\hat{\theta} + \delta_1 > \delta_1 - \frac{\delta_1}{2} = \frac{\delta_1}{2} > 0$ for the first integral in (2). Hence, $0 < \frac{\delta_1}{2} \leq \hat{\theta} - t \leq \pi$ and $\tan((\hat{\theta}-t)/2)$ are well defined (Riemann integrable). Similarly, one can show the other integral in (2) is also Riemann integrable. And (2) easily follows, in particular,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial T_1\tau_1(e^{i\theta})}{\partial\theta}(0) &= -\frac{1}{2}\int_{-\pi}^{-\delta_1}\frac{\tau_1(e^{it})}{\sin^2((-t)/2)}\,\mathrm{d}t - \frac{\tau_1(e^{-i\pi})}{\tan(\pi/2)} \\ &\quad -\frac{1}{2}\int_{\delta_2}^{\pi}\frac{\tau_1(e^{it})}{\sin^2((-t)/2)}\,\mathrm{d}t + \frac{\tau_1(e^{i\pi})}{\tan(-\pi/2)} < 0,\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

which finishes the proof. □

Proof of Proposition 2.1. As mentioned before, A'_j is a smooth analytic disc attached to M, of which the exit vector $\frac{\partial A'_j}{\partial r}(1)$ points to the pseudoconvex side of M at $(0,0)$. By investigating $\Sigma_- \cup (0,0)$, it is not hard to see the existence of another smooth analytic disc B attached to M with the exit vector pointing pseudoconvex side. Note that pseudoconvex sides in this paragraph are, in fact, in different side, because $P_z^{-1}\Sigma_+ \cap M$ is pseudoconvex but the other is pseudoconcave in sense of Definition 2.1.

By a well-known argument of a translation of a nontangent analytic disc (see 2.12 of Chapter V in [17]), the proposition follows. □

4. Corollaries

Theorem 0.1 has several applications. The main point of it is to remove "pseudoconvex" condition from known results, e.g. in [8] and [2]. We do not want to write out all of them because the wish for the conciseness of this note.

However, we mention that, one of most important applications is the one obtained by combining result of Theorem 0.1 with that of Bedford-Pinchuk's theorem in [3].

Corollary 4.1. *Let* $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^2$ *be a bounded domain with smooth boundary of finite type. Suppose that the Bergman kernel of* Ω *extends to* $\overline{\Omega} \times \overline{\Omega}$ *minus the boundary diagonal set as a locally bounded function. There is a hyperbolic orbit boundary accumulation point on* $\partial\Omega$ *if and only if* Ω *is biholomorphic to one of the ellipsoids* $\{(z, w) : |z|^{2m} + |w|^2 < 1, m \in \mathbb{Z}^+\}$. □

Acknowledgments. I thank to my advisor Prof. Steven Krantz for always being patience to answer any question, who also encouraged me to write up this paper and carefully read the article.

References

[1] M. Salah Baouendi, Peter Ebenfelt, and Linda Preiss Rothschild, *Real submanifolds in complex space and their mappings*, Princeton Mathematical Series, vol. 47, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1999. MR1668103 (2000b:32066)

[2] E. Bedford and S. I. Pinchuk, *Domains in* $\mathbf{C}^2$ *with noncompact groups of holomorphic automorphisms*, Mat. Sb. (N.S.) **135(177)** (1988), no. 2, 147–157, 271. MR937803 (89d:32054)

[3] Eric Bedford and Sergey Pinchuk, *Domains in* $\mathbf{C}^{n+1}$ *with noncompact automorphism group*, J. Geom. Anal. **1** (1991), no. 3, 165–191. MR1120679 (92f:32024)

[4] Eric Bedford and Sergey Pinchuk, *Domains in* $\mathbf{C}^2$ *with noncompact automorphism groups*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **47** (1998), no. 1, 199–222. MR1631557 (99e:32058)

[5] S. Bell, *Compactness of families of holomorphic mappings up to the boundary*, Complex analysis (University Park, Pa., 1986), 1987, pp. 29–42. MR907051 (88k:32066)

[6] Steve Bell and Ewa Ligocka, *A simplification and extension of Fefferman's theorem on biholomorphic mappings*, Invent. Math. **57** (1980), no. 3, 283–289. MR568937 (81i:32017)

[7] Albert Boggess, *CR manifolds and the tangential Cauchy-Riemann complex*, Studies in Advanced Mathematics, CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, 1991. MR1211412 (94e:32035)

[8] Jisoo Byun, *On the boundary accumulation points for the holomorphic automorphism groups*, Michigan Math. J. **51** (2003), no. 2, 379–386. MR1992953 (2004d:32023)

[9] R. E. Greene and S. G. Krantz, *Invariants of Bergman geometry and the automorphism groups of domains in* $\mathbf{C}^n$, Geometrical and algebraical aspects in several complex variables (Cetraro, 1989), 1991, pp. 107–136. MR1222210 (95d:32038)

[10] Robert E. Greene and Steven G. Krantz, *Techniques for studying automorphisms of weakly pseudoconvex domains*, Several complex variables (Stockholm, 1987/1988), 1993, pp. 389–410. MR1207869 (94b:32016)

[11] Kang-Tae Kim and Jean-Christophe Yoccoz, *CR manifolds admitting a CR contraction*, J. Geom. Anal. **21** (2011), no. 2, 476–493. MR2772081 (2012g:32049)

[12] Sung-Yeon Kim, *Domains with hyperbolic orbit accumulation boundary points*, J. Geom. Anal. **22** (2012), no. 1, 90–106. MR2868959

[13] Steven G. Krantz, *Boundary decomposition of the Bergman kernel*, Rocky Mountain J. Math. **41** (2011), no. 4, 1265–1272. MR2826535 (2012i:32005)

[14] Steven G. Krantz, *Geometric properties of boundary orbit accumulation points* **16** (2012), 151–161 (English).

[15] Mario Landucci, *The automorphism group of domains with boundary points of infinite type*, Illinois J. Math. **48** (2004), no. 3, 875–885. MR2114256 (2005i:32023)

[16] Bingyuan Liu, *on the doamin with noncompact automorphism groups*, Preprint (2013).

[17] Joël Merker and Egmont Porten, *Holomorphic extension of CR functions, envelopes of holomorphy, and removable singularities*, IMRS Int. Math. Res. Surv. (2006), Art. ID 28925, 287. MR2270252 (2007m:32020)

[18] Raghavan Narasimhan, *Several complex variables*, Chicago Lectures in Mathematics, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL, 1995. Reprint of the 1971 original. MR1324108 (95k:32001)

[19] J. Palis and J.-C. Yoccoz, *Differentiable conjugacies of Morse-Smale diffeomorphisms*, Bol. Soc. Brasil. Mat. (N.S.) **20** (1990), no. 2, 25–48. MR1143172 (93d:58083)

[20] Jean-Pierre Rosay, *Sur une caractérisation de la boule parmi les domaines de* $\mathbf{C}^n$ *par son groupe d'automorphismes*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **29** (1979), no. 4, ix, 91–97. MR558590 (81a:32016)

[21] J.-M. Trépreau, *Sur le prolongement holomorphe des fonctions C-R défines sur une hypersurface réelle de classe* C^2 *dans* $\mathbf{C}^n$, Invent. Math. **83** (1986), no. 3, 583–592. MR827369 (87f:32035)

[22] A. E. Tumanov, *Extension of CR-functions into a wedge*, Mat. Sb. **181** (1990), no. 7, 951–964. MR1070489 (91f:32010)

[23] B. Wong, *Characterization of the unit ball in* $\mathbf{C}^n$ *by its automorphism group*, Invent. Math. **41** (1977), no. 3, 253–257. MR0492401 (58 #11521)

Department of Mathematics, Washington University, Saint Louis, USA
E-mail address: `bingyuan@math.wustl.edu`